

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH] Virtual ethernet device (v2.1)  
Posted by [Patrick McHardy](#) on Wed, 11 Jul 2007 13:12:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Pavel Emelianov wrote:

> Patrick McHardy wrote:

>

>>Mhh doing it later means dealing with compatibility issues, which

>>is why I'm asking now. We currently support IFLA\_NAME, IFLA\_MTU,

>

>

> Oh, I see.

>

>

>>IFLA\_TXQLEN, IFLA\_WEIGHT, IFLA\_OPERSTATE and IFLA\_LINKMODE, and

>>with my patch additionally IFLA\_ADDRESS and IFLA\_BROADCAST.

>>AFAICT they are all applicable for the partner link as well.

>

>

> Agree. Maybe it is better to make some generic routine to create the

> device with the parameters specified in the netlink packet. Then the

> generic code creates one end of a tunnel and calls ->new\_link callback.

> This callback extracts the PARTNER packet part and calls this generic

> routine to create the second pair.

Something like that. Moving the part between NLM\_F\_CREATE and the  
ops->newlink call of rtnl\_newlink to a new function should work.

For now you could even parse the IFLA\_PARTNER attribute and nested  
IFLA\_NAME/IFLA\_ADDRESS attributes yourself and ignore the rest,  
this will at least leave us the option of handling it generically  
later.

---